

## REMARKS

Claims 1 to 6 and 14 to 21 remain pending in the above-identified application.

### §102 Rejections

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 5, 6, and 14 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,469,740 (“Kuroda et al.”).

#### Claim 1

Addressing claim 1, the Examiner stated that Kuroda et al. discloses all the claim elements, including “a reference voltage source (72/86, Vref) inherently coupled between a second ground\* and one of the reset lines via the switching device (col. 10, lines 36-57; col. 11, lines 1-15) ....” October 11, 2006 Office Action, pp. 2 and 3. The Examiner further found that Kuroda et al. inherently discloses a reference voltage source coupled to a second ground “because in col. 11, lines 1-15, Kuroda states that the reference voltage in fig. 5 is zero volts.” Id., p. 3. Applicant respectfully traverses.

Fig. 4 of Kuroda et al. illustrates an operational amplifier 71 with (1) a positive input terminal coupled to a reference signal Vref and (2) an output terminal coupled to reset transistors 75 of pixels 23. See col. 10, lines 25 to 35. However, Kuroda et al. is silent as to how reference signal Vref is generated and whether or not reference signal Vref is ground referenced.

The Examiner appeared to assume that reference signal Vref is ground referenced because Fig. 5 of Kuroda et al. illustrates a line 86 that denotes a reference voltage (0V). See also col. 11, lines 4 to 15. However, line 86 is only used to show where the voltage is 0V in contrast to a line 85 used to indicate reference signal Vref. As Fig. 5 clearly shows, line 85 shows that reference signal Vref is at some voltage greater than 0V. “Reference numeral 86 denotes a reference voltage (0V) of the reference signal 85.” Kuroda et al., lines 11 and 12.

Thus, Kuroda et al. does not disclose that reference signal Vref is a ground referenced reset voltage. For the above reason, claim 1 is patentable over Kuroda et al.

#### Claims 5, 6, and 14

Claims 5, 6, and 14 depend from claim 1 and are patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

### § 103 Rejections

#### Claim 3

The Examiner rejected claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuroda et al.

Claim 3 depends from claim 1 and is patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

#### Claim 4

The Examiner rejected claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuroda et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,002,123 (“Suzuki”).

Claim 4 depends from claim 1 and is patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

#### Claims 15 to 20

The Examiner rejected claims 15 to 20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,133,862 (“Dhuse et al.”) in view of Kuroda et al.

Claim 15 recites similar limitations as claim 1. Accordingly, claim 15 is patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Claims 16 to 20 depend from claim 15 and are patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 15.

#### Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant thanks the Examiner for allowing claim 2 and indicating that claim 21 is allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of its base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicant has not amended claim 21 to independent form because Applicant believes it base claim 1 is patentable over the cited references.

Summary

In summary, claims 1 to 6 and 14 to 21 were pending in the present application. For the above reasons, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the claim rejections and allow claims 1 to 6 and 14 to 21. Should the Examiner have any questions, please call the undersigned at (408) 382-0480x206.

Respectfully submitted,

/David C Hsia/

David C. Hsia  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Reg. No. 46,235

Patent Law Group LLP  
2635 North First St., Ste. 223  
San Jose, California 95134  
408-382-0480x206